

WORMHOLES AND SUPERSYMMETRYJ.R. ANGLIN[†] AND R.C. MYERS[‡]

*Physics Department, McGill University
Ernest Rutherford Building
3600 University Street
Montreal, Quebec, CANADA H3A 2T8*

ABSTRACT: We derive an effective local operator produced by certain wormhole instantons in a theory containing a massless Wess-Zumino multiplet coupled to N=1 supergravity. The induced interactions are D terms, and hence will not lead to spontaneous supersymmetry breaking. We conclude that supersymmetry suppresses wormhole-induced matter couplings.

[†] anglin@physics.mcgill.ca

[‡] rcm@physics.mcgill.ca

1. INTRODUCTION

Tunneling amplitudes for spatial topology change in Euclidean quantum gravity have become sources of interest, speculation, and controversy. The simple case of the “wormhole” instanton (a Euclidean metric configuration in which two asymptotically flat regions are connected by a narrow “throat”) has been used to describe tunneling processes in which baby universes are created and annihilated. These calculations typically show that wormholes lead in the low energy limit to effective local interactions among matter fields[andyrev]. In the present paper, we consider a wormhole in a theory of a massless supersymmetric scalar multiplet coupled to $N=1$ supergravity. We find no evidence of wormhole induced supersymmetry breaking in this model. We do find that, as long predicted[k], supersymmetry cancels the simple scalar self-coupling found in the comparable purely bosonic theory[cole,ab].

In the remaining part of this introduction, we will describe the basic features of the argument we will follow. In section 2, we consider a wormhole in a bosonic theory, with a massless complex field coupled to Einstein gravity. The derivation of the local operator induced by the wormhole is essentially the same as that originally presented by Reference [cole]. In section 3, we will introduce supersymmetry, and obtain an original result exactly like that of section 2, but in superspace; on this excuse we will refer to the instanton considered in section 3 as a “superwormhole.” Section 4 is a brief conclusion. An appendix follows, containing the detailed supergravity calculations supporting section 3.

Our goal is to determine the effect at experimentally accessible scales of wormholes that are very much smaller than those experimental scales, yet sufficiently larger than the Planck scale for us to use general relativity (and ultimately supergravity) in our action. At present, there is plenty of room between those scales — about 17 orders of magnitude — within which to fit our wormholes. Following Coleman and Lee[cole], we will construct a

field configuration in Euclidean four-space in which a three-ball of radius r_0 is cut out of a flat background space and replaced with the end of a wormhole, matching our fields at the boundary. We will perform a saddle-point approximation to the path integral using this “cut and patch” configuration, and we will find that the leading contributions to the action coming from the wormhole insertion are boundary terms on the sphere at r_0 . Choosing r_0 to be small on the laboratory scale, these terms may be replaced by point-like interactions. Thus we arrive at a set of local interactions induced by the wormholes in the effective low energy theory.

Note that wormholes in supersymmetric theories have also been considered in References [10,fay,gerry].

2. THE BOSONIC WORMHOLE

As a preliminary exercise, we consider wormholes in the purely bosonic theory of a massless, complex scalar coupled to Einstein gravity. The essential results have been found previously in [cole, ab]. Our analysis differs slightly from the previous derivations, and we also find the next of the higher dimension operators induced by the wormholes. While these next-to-leading order local terms play an insignificant role in the low energy bosonic theory, they are important for the supersymmetric wormhole considered in the following section. In Euclidean space, we consider the Lagrangian

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{L}_0 &= -e(M_P^2 R - \nabla_\mu \phi^\dagger \nabla^\mu \phi) \\ &= -eM_P^2 R + \frac{1}{2}e(\nabla_\mu f \nabla^\mu f + f^2 \nabla_\mu \theta \nabla^\mu \theta),\end{aligned}\tag{1}$$

where $\phi = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}f e^{i\theta}$, M_P is the Planck mass[†], and R is the Ricci scalar.

[†] In the following, we explicitly retain $M_P = (16\pi G)^{-\frac{1}{2}}$ in our equations, while setting $\hbar = c = 1$.

We shall look for wormholes using the spherically symmetric *ansatz*

$$f = f(r) \quad \theta = \theta(r) \quad ds^2 = \frac{dr^2}{h(r)^2} + r^2 d\Omega_3^2, \quad (ans)$$

where $d\Omega_3^2$ is the line element on the round unit three-sphere. When we refer to any fields in the following, we will mean only their spherically symmetric components as described in (ans).

The field equation produced from variations of θ has the form $\partial_\mu J^\mu = 0$ where $J^\mu = eg^{\mu\nu} f^2 \partial_\nu \theta$ is the conserved current density associated with global variations of θ (*i.e.*, global phase rotations of ϕ). With our ansatz, this equation may be integrated to yield

$$hr^3 f^2 \partial_r \theta = iQ \quad (6)$$

where we have chosen an imaginary integration constant on the right. This Euclidean charge is imaginary to describe tunneling between states with real Lorentzian charge[cole]. With this choice, the field equations determining f and h may be written as

$$\partial_r(hr^3 \partial_r f) = -\frac{Q^2}{hr^3 f^3} \quad (7)$$

$$12M_P^2 r^4 (1 - h^2) = \frac{Q^2}{f^2} - (hr^3 \nabla_r f)^2. \quad (8)$$

Imaginary Q also implies that (the lowest angular mode of) the field θ is imaginary. Various arguments can be advanced to explain this use of an imaginary charge and field, but the clearest involves Routhians[cliff, gold]. In this formalism, the cyclic variable θ is eliminated from the path integral in favour of its conjugate momentum. Consider the spherically symmetric sector of the path integral for the scalar field theory (without gravity),

$$\langle F | e^{-2\pi^2 \int dr \mathcal{H}_{sphere}} | I \rangle \sim \int \mathcal{D}f \mathcal{D}\theta \mathcal{D}\pi \mathcal{D}Q e^{-2\pi^2 \int dr (\mathcal{H}(\pi, Q, f) - i\pi \partial_r f - iQ \partial_r \theta)}, \quad (2)$$

where π and Q are the momentum densities conjugate to f and θ , respectively, and $\mathcal{H}$ is the Hamiltonian density. Note that $\mathcal{H}$ is independent of θ . We have Wick rotated $t \rightarrow -ir$.

Implicitly the path integral above (and in the following) includes wave functionals weighting the boundary values as is appropriate for the initial and final states (which we may assume are standard N-particle states). The momentum sector of the path integral is a Gaussian, since $\mathcal{H}$ is quadratic in the momenta. Performing these momentum integrals leaves the usual path integral involving only the fields and the Lagrangian density[Feyn]. In the present case, it is a simple matter to integrate the cyclic field θ rather than Q to give

$$\langle F | e^{-2\pi^2 \int dr \mathcal{H}_{sphere}} | I \rangle \sim \int \mathcal{D}f \mathcal{D}Q \delta(\partial_r Q) e^{i2\pi^2 Q(\theta_F - \theta_I)} e^{-2\pi^2 \int dr \mathcal{R}} , \quad (\text{routh0})$$

where

$$\mathcal{R} = \frac{1}{2} r^3 (\partial_r f)^2 + \frac{1}{2} \frac{Q^2}{r^3 f^2} . \quad (\text{routh1})$$

With this approach, we acquire a phase factor at each of the boundaries and a delta function forcing Q to be constant for all r . The remaining path integral over f is weighted by the Routhian (routh1). The Euler-Lagrange equation for stationary points of this new functional is

$$\partial_r (r^3 \partial_r f) = -\frac{Q}{r^3 f^3} , \quad (ff)$$

which is the analogue of (7) with a fixed, flat metric (*i.e.*, $h = 1$).

We will assume that the above approach can be extended to include gravity by the following simple procedure: add the Einstein action (including the necessary surface term[surf]) to the Routhian; covariantize the scalar field theory; and insert our spherically symmetric mini-superspace ansatz (2) for the metric. The truncation of the gravity sector in the final step still allows us to derive the field equations, and to evaluate the classical action for our wormhole configuration. Equations (routh0) and (routh1) are then replaced by

$$\langle F | e^{-2\pi^2 \int dr \mathcal{H}_{sphere}} | I \rangle \sim \int \mathcal{D}h \mathcal{D}f e^{i2\pi^2 Q(\theta_F - \theta_I)} e^{-2\pi^2 \int dr \mathcal{R}} \quad (\text{new1})$$

where

$$\mathcal{R} = 6M_P^2 \left[\partial_r (r^2 h) - r \left(h + \frac{1}{h} \right) \right] + \frac{1}{2} h r^3 (\partial_r f)^2 + \frac{1}{2} \frac{Q^2}{h r^3 f^2} \quad (\text{new2})$$

and Q is now a fixed constant. It is easy to see that the Euler-Lagrange equations for stationary points of (new2) are just (7) and (8), as before. The usual Lagrangian formalism requires one to consider *a priori* imaginary θ arising from Eq. (6). In contrast, in the Routhian approach, θ is eliminated by integration over the real axis. Since an equivalent saddlepoint approximation may be derived by either method, we can choose whichever technique we like. The Routhian formalism, although more rigorous, is more cumbersome.

Now we find wormhole solutions of Eqs. (7) and (8). Differentiating (8) and applying (7) yields $\partial_r(r^4(1 - h^2)) = 0$, which implies

$$h^2 = 1 - \frac{L^4}{r^4} . \quad (10)$$

This metric is exactly the same as that found by Giddings and Strominger[5] with a different matter field. The apparent singularity at $r = L$ is merely a co-ordinate singularity[myers]. The complete geometry is covered by two identical co-ordinate patches with $r_{\pm}$ both ranging from L to ∞ . The wormhole then consists of two asymptotically flat regions where $r_{\pm} \rightarrow \infty$, connected at $r_{\pm} = L$ by a throat with radius L .

Substituting (10) into (8) yields

$$f \partial_r f = \pm \frac{\sqrt{Q^2 - 12M_P^2 L^4 f^2}}{r^3 \sqrt{1 - (L/r)^4}} \quad (f6)$$

which may be integrated to give

$$\sqrt{Q^2 - 12M_P^2 L^4 f^2} = \pm 6M_P^2 L^2 \left[\arccos\left(\frac{L^2}{r^2}\right) + C \right] , \quad (ff6)$$

where C is a (real) integration constant. Defining

$$x \equiv 6M_P^2 L^2 \left[\arccos\left(\frac{L^2}{r^2}\right) + C \right] \quad (xdef)$$

we have

$$f = \frac{\sqrt{Q^2 - x^2}}{2\sqrt{3}M_P L^2} . \quad (11)$$

In Eq. (xdef) the positive (negative) branch of the $\arccos$ is used on the r_+ (r_-) co-ordinate patch. Thus asymptotically at large radius,

$$x = 6M_P^2 L^2 \left[C \pm \frac{\pi}{2} \mp \frac{L^2}{r_{\pm}^2} + \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{L^4}{r_{\pm}^4}\right) \right],$$

while the throat corresponds to $x = 6M_P^2 L^2 C$. Although the wormhole geometry is symmetric on either side of the wormhole, in general the scalar field f is not when C is non-vanishing.

We will connect the wormhole to a background field configuration using a cut-and-paste procedure[cole]. We cut the wormhole off at some *fixed* scale r_0 in both asymptotic regions. Then we cut two three-spheres of radius r_0 out of the background and replace them with the ends of the wormhole, taking care to match the boundary values of f to the background values $f_{\pm}$ at $r_{\pm} = r_0$.[†] The scale r_0 serves as the infrared cut-off for the wormhole field configuration, which is necessary to avoid encountering divergences in evaluating the action for the full wormhole[cole,ab]. We may assume that r_0 is the ultraviolet cutoff for the effective low energy theory. The wormhole ends thus appear as the insertions of local operators since their internal structure is beyond the limit of experimental resolution. Further, we assume that L , the size of the wormhole, is near (but larger than) the Planck scale[‡], so that L^2/r_0^2 is an extremely small ratio. This greatly simplifies the following calculations.

The integration constants L and C are fixed by matching f at $r_{\pm} = r_0$ to the background values $f_{\pm}$. Eq. (ff6) gives

$$\begin{aligned} 12M_P^2 f_{\pm}^2 &= \frac{Q^2}{L^4} - 36M_P^4 \left[C + \arccos\left(\frac{L^2}{r_{\pm}^2}\right) \right]^2 \Big|_{r_{\pm}=r_0} \\ &\simeq \frac{Q^2}{L^4} - 36M_P^4 (C \pm \frac{\pi}{2})^2, \end{aligned} \tag{12}$$

[†] Note that our procedure differs from that implemented in [cole]. There, the cut-off on either side of the wormhole depends on the background field $f_{\pm}$, and C is fixed to be zero.

[‡] This assumption is, of course, at the centre of a controversy[big], to which we have nothing to add.

where terms of order $\frac{L^2}{r_0^2}$ are dropped in the second line. We therefore have

$$C = \frac{f_-^2 - f_+^2}{6\pi M_P^2} \quad (13)$$

and

$$\frac{Q^2}{L^4} = M_P^4 \left[9\pi^2 + 6 \frac{f_+^2 + f_-^2}{M_P^2} + \frac{(f_-^2 - f_+^2)^2}{\pi^2 M_P^4} \right]. \quad (14)$$

Note that (14) will only be consistent given the assumption that $L > M_P^{-1}$ for large Q^2 . A final comment on matching boundary conditions is that in the background region beyond $r_{\pm} = r_0$ we employ the standard Lagrangian formalism, and therefore immediately outside the cut-off surface we must enforce (6), so that the background θ field is complex.

Now the integral of the Routhian (new2) can be calculated for the wormhole solution. One finds

$$2\pi^2 \int dr \mathcal{R} = \pi^2 Q \log \left| \frac{Q + 6M_P^2 L^2 (C + \frac{\pi}{2})}{Q - 6M_P^2 L^2 (C + \frac{\pi}{2})} \frac{Q + 6M_P^2 L^2 (C - \frac{\pi}{2})}{Q - 6M_P^2 L^2 (C - \frac{\pi}{2})} \right| \quad (15)$$

where terms of order $(L/r_0)^2$ have again been neglected. We have assumed Q to be positive. (With $Q < 0$, the two ends of the wormhole would be switched.) To evaluate this expression, we use (13) and (14), and work perturbatively in $f_{\pm}^2/M_P^2$. The final result is

$$2\pi^2 \int dr \mathcal{R} \simeq -2\pi^2 Q \ln \left(\frac{f_+}{\sqrt{3}\pi M_P} \frac{f_-}{\sqrt{3}\pi M_P} \right) + 2\pi^2 Q \left(\frac{f_+^2}{3\pi^2 M_P^2} + \frac{f_-^2}{3\pi^2 M_P^2} \right), \quad (16)$$

where terms of order $(f_{\pm}/M_P)^4$ have been ignored. Thus to tree-level order, the contribution of a single wormhole in the path integral including the phase factors appearing in (new1) becomes

$$e^{i2\pi^2 Q(\theta_+ - \theta_-)} e^{-2\pi^2 \int dr \mathcal{R}} \simeq A^q \phi_+^q \phi_-^{\dagger q} (1 - qA\phi_+ \phi_+^{\dagger})(1 - qA\phi_- \phi_-^{\dagger}) \quad (17)$$

where $\phi_{\pm} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} f_{\pm} e^{i\theta_{\pm}}$ are the background scalar field values at $r_{\pm} = r_0$. Since (as we noted above) the background field θ is imaginary, $\phi^{\dagger} \equiv \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} f e^{-i\theta}$ is not the Hermitian conjugate of ϕ but an independent real field. Upon analytic continuation back to Minkowski space,

however, $\phi^\dagger$ again denotes the usual Hermitian conjugate. Also $q = 2\pi^2 Q$ is the scalar charge quantized to take values $q = 1, 2, 3, \dots$, and $A \equiv \frac{2}{3\pi^2 M_P^2}$.

If we assume that the three-spheres $r_\pm = r_0$ can be taken as the “effective points” $x_\pm^\mu$ in the background space-time, then the effective path integral including a single wormhole is

$$\int \mathcal{D}f \mathcal{D}\theta e^{-\int d^4x \mathcal{L}_0} A^q \phi^q (1 - Aq\phi^\dagger\phi) \Big|_{x=x_+} \phi^{\dagger q} (1 - Aq\phi^\dagger\phi) \Big|_{x=x_-}, \quad (\text{back})$$

where we have suppressed the gravity sector in this expression. Translations of $x_\pm^\mu$ are zero modes of this system, and so will be integrated over upon evaluating quadratic fluctuations in the saddlepoint approximation[1]. Introducing an unknown normalization constant B_q^2 , which contains the 1-loop determinant for a wormhole of charge q , (back) becomes

$$\int \mathcal{D}f \mathcal{D}\theta e^{-\int d^4x \mathcal{L}_0} B_q^2 \int d^4x_+ A^{q/2} \phi^q (1 - Aq\phi^\dagger\phi) \int d^4x_- A^{q/2} \phi^{\dagger q} (1 - Aq\phi^\dagger\phi). \quad (\text{better})$$

One can show that $B_q \propto M_P^4$ [cole]. Further arguments can be made to the effect that accounting for many-wormhole configurations within the dilute gas approximation leads to a modification of the effective low energy action by terms of the form[alpha]

$$B_q A^{\frac{q}{2}} \int d^4x (\alpha_q^\dagger \phi^q + \alpha_q \phi^{\dagger q}) (1 - Aq\phi^\dagger\phi) \quad (19)$$

where α_q and $\alpha_q^\dagger$ might be thought of as creation and annihilation operators for baby universes carrying global charge q [andy].

Our results are essentially the same as those found in Refs. [cole, ab], although our derivation differs. Implicit in our suppression of the gravity sector in (back) and (better) is the limit $M_P \rightarrow \infty$, or rather that the energy scales of interest are much lower than M_P . Thus the wormhole-induced interactions are highly suppressed by the factors of $A \propto \frac{1}{M_P^2}$ (for large values of q , and excluding the possibility of drastic effects due to the α parameter dynamics). They remain as significant operators since they break the global phase rotation symmetry $\phi \rightarrow e^{i\delta} \phi$, which would be conserved in all interactions induced by conventional

perturbative processes[†]. We have included the next-to-leading order wormhole operators, $\phi^{q+1}\phi^\dagger$ and $\phi^{\dagger q+1}\phi$. Since these interactions have a higher mass dimension, they are suppressed by an extra factor of A . Therefore they will play an insignificant role in the present bosonic theory, but we will find that they are important for the supersymmetric case considered in the next section.

Recall that our evaluation of (16) included a perturbative expansion in $f_\pm^2/M_P^2$, but for a strictly massless scalar, it would be difficult to argue that these parameters should be small in the low energy theory. Following References [cole,ab], one may consider our discussion to apply to a scalar field with a small mass. With $mr_0 \ll 1$, the mass can be neglected in the wormhole region, but $f_\pm^2/M_P^2 < (M_P mr_0^2)^{-2}$ remains small in the low energy regime. Alternatively, one can think of this expansion as a formal device, which is useful since it develops an expansion of wormhole-induced operators of ascending mass dimension, and hence of decreasing significance in the low energy theory. A final comment is that to the order of this expansion that we calculated, the wormhole contribution (17) factorized into separate operators at x_+ and x_- . This fact is important in separating the effect of the full wormhole into two local operators in (back), but there is no principle which guarantees such a result. In other cases, this factorization has been found to fail[grin], and indeed it fails in the present case at the next order beyond those we have displayed.

[†] Ignoring gravity in the present case eliminates all such *perturbative* processes, since in (1) we only consider a free massless scalar field. The above statement would be more meaningful for the case of two interacting scalars, with the Lagrangian density

$$\mathcal{L} = e(|\nabla\phi_1|^2 + |\nabla\phi_2|^2 + \lambda|\phi_1|^2|\phi_2|^2) ,$$

for which the above analysis would proceed unchanged for both ϕ_1 and ϕ_2 , separately. Of course, there may also be contributions from new wormholes carrying charge for both ϕ_1 and ϕ_2 .

3. THE SUPERWORMHOLE

We now wish to study wormholes in a supersymmetric theory. Explicitly, we will consider a Wess-Zumino multiplet coupled to $N = 1$ supergravity. The essential new aspect in this case is the application of saddlepoint approximations to a theory containing fermions as well as bosons. In this case, the fermionic zero modes will produce anticommuting collective co-ordinates. The specifics of the supergravity theory are irrelevant to most of our results in this section. Therefore in the interests of clarity, we will leave the details concerning the fermionic zero modes of the superwormhole to Appendix A. All that we require is to note the theory possesses the following properties:

- 1) If all fermion fields are set equal to zero, we recover the Lagrangian of section 2. Therefore the wormhole solution of that section is also a saddlepoint of the present theory.
- 2) In the limit $M_P \rightarrow \infty$ we obtain the massless Wess-Zumino model, with vanishing super-potential, in flat space. This fixes the form of the supersymmetry transformations in the following.
- 3) The theory is $N = 1$ supersymmetric in Euclidean four-space. Thus when fermionic zero modes arise in the fluctuation determinant of the saddlepoint, the corresponding collective co-ordinate is a Grassman four-spinor η .

In Appendix A, we find fermionic zero modes in the wormhole background, which arise because of the invariance of the action under supersymmetry transformations. There are four independent modes associated with each end of the wormhole. Each mode is equivalent to a global Wess-Zumino supersymmetry transformation in one asymptotic region, and vanishes in the opposite asymptotic region. These zero modes (as well as the bosonic ones) are separated, and the saddlepoint expansion is performed only on the remaining modes of the path integral[raja].

Let $\Theta(\varepsilon)$ be the charge generating the Wess-Zumino supersymmetry transformation of property 3 parameterized by an arbitrary Grassman parameter ε . The fermion zero modes η may be separated by constructing the wormhole path integral with identity operators $e^{-i\Theta(\eta)} e^{i\Theta(\eta)}$ inserted between the time-slices. To leading order in the saddlepoint expansion, we obtain the bilocal effective interaction

$$\hat{B}_q^2 \int d^4x_+ d^4x_- d^4\eta_+ d^4\eta_- e^{-i\Theta(\eta_+)} O_w(x_+) O_w^\dagger(x_-) e^{i\Theta(\eta_-)} , \quad (effint)$$

where $O_w \equiv A^q \phi^q (1 - Aq\phi^\dagger \phi)$ is the bosonic operator found in section 2, and $\eta_+(\eta_-)$ are the fermion zero modes, which are constant in the asymptotic region with $r_+(r_-)$ but vanish for $r_-(r_+) \rightarrow \infty$. The result of the fluctuation determinant is contained in $\hat{B}_q^2$. In this case, we may assume as a result of property 3 that the fermionic and bosonic determinant terms with all zero modes extracted cancel each other, but there will be factors arising from the normalization of the zero modes. In particular, $\hat{B}_q$ will have the dimensions of mass squared.

Above, we have taken the Euclidean time to flow radially through the wormhole, increasing in the direction of growing x or r_+ . We relate our result (effint) to the choice where time flows in a fixed direction across the background regions (see Figure 1) as follows: The wormhole path integral with radial time produces an evolution operator from the surface I (at $r_- = r_0$) to F (at $r_+ = r_0$). This operator is inserted between the surfaces $i_\pm$ and $f_\pm$ in the background spaces. The integrals of the supercurrent over I and F yielding the charges $\Theta(\eta_\pm)$ are then split into two integrals over these background surfaces. After baby universe α parameters are used to localize the effective interaction as in section 2, the above procedure yields an effective operator for the superwormholes of the form

$$\hat{B}_q A^{q/2} \int d^4x d^4\eta e^{-i\Theta(\eta)} (\alpha_q^\dagger \phi^q + \alpha_q \phi^{\dagger q}) (1 - Aq\phi^\dagger \phi) e^{i\Theta(\eta)} . \quad (yes!)$$

This is clearly a superspace vertex[6], so that as expected the superwormhole terms manifestly preserve the supersymmetry of the low energy background theory. From here on-

wards, the superspace formalism provides the most elegant framework for describing the low energy limit of superwormholes.

The massless Wess-Zumino model without a superpotential has the simple Euclidean action

$$\mathcal{S}_{WZ} = \int d^4x [\delta^{\mu\nu} \partial_\mu \phi^\dagger \partial_\nu \phi + \frac{1}{2} \bar{\chi} \not{\partial} \chi - F^\dagger F] , \quad (wzlag)$$

where $\delta^{\mu\nu}$ is the flat Euclidean metric, and $\not{\partial} = \gamma^\mu \partial_\mu$. The matter fields have some unfamiliar characteristics due to the analytic continuation required to implement supersymmetry in Euclidean four-space. (Appendix A discusses this point at length.) The essential point is that because there are no Majorana spinors in Euclidean four-space, the adjoint spinors are defined as $\bar{\chi} \equiv \chi^T C$. As a result, one must again think of ϕ and $\phi^\dagger$ (and F and $F^\dagger$, as well) as independent fields. $\mathcal{S}_{WZ}$ is invariant under the following global supersymmetry:

$$\begin{aligned} \delta\phi &= \sqrt{2}\bar{\varepsilon}P_L\chi & \delta\phi^\dagger &= \sqrt{2}\bar{\varepsilon}P_R\chi \\ \delta\chi &= \sqrt{2}P_L(\not{\partial}\phi + F)\varepsilon + \sqrt{2}P_R(\not{\partial}\phi^\dagger + F^\dagger)\varepsilon & (fsusy) \\ \delta F &= \sqrt{2}\bar{\varepsilon}\not{\partial}P_L\chi & \delta F^\dagger &= \sqrt{2}\bar{\varepsilon}\not{\partial}P_R\chi , \end{aligned}$$

where $P_{L/R} \equiv \frac{1}{2}(1 \pm \gamma_5)$.

The auxillary fields, F and $F^\dagger$, are decoupled in (wzlag), and can be trivially integrated out. Their virtue is that they allow the supersymmetry transformations (fsusy) to close off-shell. Therefore when the action is altered by the addition of our wormhole terms, the supersymmetry transformations remain unchanged if we include F . The supersymmetries of the free and wormhole-modified actions would differ if expressed in terms of physical fields only. The scalar superfield $\Phi(x^\mu, \varepsilon)$ may be defined as the image of $\phi(x^\mu)$ under a finite supersymmetry transformation:

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi(x, \varepsilon) &\equiv e^{-i\Theta(\varepsilon)} \phi(x) e^{i\Theta(\varepsilon)} \\ &= \phi + \sqrt{2}\bar{\varepsilon}P_L\chi + (\bar{\varepsilon}P_L\varepsilon)F + (\bar{\varepsilon}P_L\gamma^\mu\varepsilon)\partial_\mu\phi + \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(\bar{\varepsilon}P_L\varepsilon)\bar{\varepsilon}\not{\partial}P_L\chi + \frac{1}{8}(\bar{\varepsilon}\varepsilon)^2\partial^\mu\partial_\mu\phi . \end{aligned} \quad (spfd)$$

Similarly $\Phi^\dagger \equiv e^{-i\Theta(\varepsilon)}\phi^\dagger e^{i\Theta(\varepsilon)}$. Since the adjoint spinor $\bar{\varepsilon}$ is a Majorana conjugate, the conjugate superfield $\Phi^\dagger$ is once again not the true complex conjugate of Φ . Its definition though does replace every P_L in (spfd) with P_R , and every ϕ with $\phi^\dagger$.

The Wess-Zumino action (wzlag) can be written as a superspace integral*

$$\mathcal{S}_{WZ} = -\frac{1}{4} \int d^4x d^4\eta \Phi^\dagger(x, \eta) \Phi(x, \eta) . \quad (s0)$$

By applying (spfd) to (yes!), we see that the superwormholes contribute extra vertices to this superspace action:

$$\hat{B}_q A^{q/2} \int d^4x d^4\eta (1 - Aq\Phi^\dagger\Phi)(\alpha_q^\dagger\Phi^q + \alpha_q\Phi^{\dagger q}) . \quad (spwmh)$$

In the end then, our result from section 2 has been supersymmetrized in the most obvious way.

4. CONCLUSION

Combining (s0) and (spwmh), we see that the effect of the superwormholes is to add extra terms to the Kahler potential of the Wess-Zumino multiplet.[‡] The Φ^q and $\Phi^{\dagger q}$ terms can be removed by a Kahler gauge transformation[twilight]. Alternatively, integrating over η in (spwmh), one finds explicitly that these terms contribute only total derivatives. Thus as expected[k], supersymmetry suppresses the wormhole-induced scalar self-couplings. This leaves

$$V(\Phi, \Phi^\dagger) = -\frac{1}{4}\Phi^\dagger\Phi + \hat{B}_q \sum_{q>0} qA^{\frac{q}{2}+1}(\alpha_q^\dagger\Phi^{q+1}\Phi^\dagger + \alpha_q\Phi^{\dagger(q+1)}\Phi) \quad (seff)$$

* One uses the standard convention for Grassman integration: $\int d\varepsilon [a\varepsilon + b] = a$ for a Grassman ε , and ordinary numbers a and b .

[‡] In this discussion, it will be assumed that we have rotated back to Lorentzian signature, and so the fields have no unusual characteristics.

as the tree-level Kahler potential incorporating the effects of superwormholes. Explicitly in terms of the physical fields, the Lagrangian density is

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L} = & -4 \bar{\partial} \partial V (\nabla_\mu \phi \nabla^\mu \phi^\dagger + \frac{1}{2} \bar{\chi} \not{V} \chi) \\ & + \bar{\chi} \gamma_5 \gamma^\mu \chi (\bar{\partial} \partial^2 V \nabla_\mu \phi - \bar{\partial}^2 \partial V \nabla_\mu \phi^\dagger) + \frac{1}{2} \left(\bar{\partial}^2 \partial^2 V - \frac{|\bar{\partial} \partial^2 V|^2}{\bar{\partial} \partial V} \right) (\bar{\chi} \chi)^2 \end{aligned} \quad (stuffl)$$

where $V = V(\phi, \phi^\dagger)$, $\partial \equiv \frac{\delta}{\delta \phi}$, and $\bar{\partial} \equiv \frac{\delta}{\delta \phi^\dagger}$. For a given charge q , the leading superwormhole induced terms are suppressed by an extra factor of M_P^{-4} , as compared to the purely bosonic theory of Section 2.

Even these latter terms are evanescent, in fact. We can absorb the superwormhole vertices to linear order in the α parameters, with a holomorphic field redefinition

$$\tilde{\Phi} = \Phi - 4 \sum_{q>0} q A^{\frac{q}{2}+1} \alpha_q^\dagger \Phi^{q+1} . \quad (redone)$$

Note that this field redefinition is α -dependent. We now recover the free Wess-Zumino model, up to terms quadratic in baby universe parameters

$$\tilde{V}(\tilde{\Phi}, \tilde{\Phi}^\dagger) = -\frac{1}{4} \tilde{\Phi}^\dagger \tilde{\Phi} - 4 \sum_{q>0} \sum_{q'>0} q q' A^{\frac{q+q'}{2}+2} \alpha_q^\dagger \alpha_{q'} \tilde{\Phi}^{q+1} \tilde{\Phi}^{\dagger q'+1} + \mathcal{O}(\alpha^3) . \quad (supp)$$

Both Kahler potentials, (seff) and (supp), will produce an equivalent physical theories. Therefore, because the leading symmetry-breaking interactions in (stuffl) can be eliminated by field redefinitions, these terms will not directly affect physical scattering processes, which might display violations of charge conservation. Terms quadratic and higher order in the α parameters, are already present in (stuffl) in the last term, which was produced by integrating out the auxillary fields, F and $F^\dagger$. A typical process with a charge violation of $\pm q$ units might then be mediated by interactions of the form

$$(\alpha_1 \alpha_{q+1}^\dagger \phi^q + \alpha_1^\dagger \alpha_{q+1} \phi^{\dagger q}) (\bar{\chi} \chi)^2 . \quad (form)$$

These superwormhole induced interactions are now suppressed by an extra factor of M_P^{-6} , as compared to the purely bosonic theory.

It may seem curious that symmetry-breaking first occurs at order α^2 . It appears then that the observable effects are only occurring in multi-wormhole processes. This result is analogous to certain instanton effects found in Reference [ian]. There, in a particular (2+1)-dimensional gauge theory, the photon and photino are found to acquire masses only through contact terms arising in multi-instanton processes. One should not think that a charge- q superwormhole (which has four fermionic zero modes) must induce interactions of the form (form) directly. This is because the fermionic zero modes are not strictly zero modes of the fermion fields, since they are extracted using finite (nonlinear) supersymmetry transformations, which involve the bosonic fields as well.

Ultimately though, we expect that interactions like (form) should arise in the single superwormhole sector. Above, we have ignored the possibility that the Kahler potential might contain higher dimension interactions such as

$$\delta V(\Phi, \Phi^\dagger) = M_P^2 \sum_{n>1} C_n \left(\frac{\Phi \Phi^\dagger}{M_P^2} \right)^n, \quad (seff1)$$

where C_n are dimensionless constants. Such terms are present in the full supergravity theory, but would also arise in the usual renormalization of the Kahler potential, when modes at wavelengths shorter than r_0 are integrated out. So far, such terms have been neglected on the basis of the arguments presented in section 2: they obey the phase rotation symmetry, and their effects should be suppressed at low energies because they yield higher dimension operators in (stuffl). In fact though, they play a significant role in the charge violating processes in the supersymmetric theory. Applying the field redefinition (redone) to $V+\delta V$ leaves symmetry breaking terms linear in the α parameters. Now a typical process with a charge violation of $\pm q$ units could be mediated by interactions of the form

$$C_2 (\alpha_q^\dagger \phi^q + \alpha_q \phi^{\dagger q}) (\bar{\chi}\chi)^2. \quad (form1)$$

Since these interactions are linear in the α parameters, they produce symmetry breaking processes in a single superwormhole background. Note that they are still second order in

a combined perturbation expansion in terms of the α 's and C 's. Of course, the new terms have the same dimension as those given in (form), and so supersymmetry suppresses the observable wormhole effects in any event.

Note that before wormhole effects are taken into account, the Wess-Zumino theory has two independent global $U(1)$ symmetries:

$$\phi \rightarrow e^{i\delta} \phi \quad \text{and} \quad \chi \rightarrow e^{i\gamma_5 \lambda} \chi. \quad (uuuu)$$

Examining the form of the interactions in (stuff), we see that the wormhole induced terms only break the phase rotation symmetry of the scalar field. The fermion's chiral rotation symmetry remains unbroken. One might expect that the latter symmetry must also be broken, since in the full supergravity theory, the global $U(1)$ symmetry requires $\delta = \lambda$. (This comes about from couplings of the matter fields with the gravitino.) In fact though, the chiral rotations are independent because of the R -symmetry of the supergravity theory: $\chi \rightarrow e^{i\gamma_5 \lambda} \chi$, $\psi_\mu \rightarrow e^{-i\gamma_5 \lambda} \psi_\mu$, $\epsilon \rightarrow e^{-i\gamma_5 \lambda} \epsilon$. This chiral symmetry may be broken by new wormholes in which the $U(1)$ charge is carried by the fermions[kim].

Finally we observe that our superwormholes do not violate the nonrenormalization theorem for chiral superfields[twilight]. This failure to induce a superpotential, means that these wormholes cannot produce spontaneous supersymmetry breaking. Essentially this occurs because there are four independent fermionic zero modes for each end of the wormhole, which leads to the $\int d^4 \eta$ in the effective local operators. A superpotential requires an F term, which would only contain a chiral Grassman integration, $\int d^2 \eta$. Such a result was found for a particular wormhole[sstev] in Reference [10]. In this case, although there are four fermionic zero modes, two are not normalizable and so do not contribute. At present, this effect appears to depend on the detailed dynamics of their theory. It would be interesting if any general statements could be made as to which theories or wormholes would yield such a result.

The authors would like to thank Cliff Burgess and Andy Strominger for useful conversations. This research was supported by NSERC of Canada, and by Fonds FCAR du Quebec. R.C.M. would like to thank the Institute for Theoretical Physics at UCSB and the Aspen Center for Physics for their hospitality at various stages of this work. At UCSB, this research was also supported in part by NSF Grant PHY 89-04035.

APPENDIX A.

In this appendix, we explicitly calculate the fermion zero modes of the wormholes in the supergravity model. Furthermore, we demonstrate the three properties on which the results of section 3 depend.

To study a superwormhole, we must extend the field theory of section 2 to a Wess-Zumino multiplet coupled to N=1 supergravity. The Lorentzian Lagrangian for such a system has been determined[bagger, cremmer]; the simplest case (*i.e.*, that with canonical kinetic terms) may be written as

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{L}_L = & -M_P^2 e R - \frac{1}{2} e (\nabla_\mu f \nabla^\mu f + f^2 \nabla_\mu \theta \nabla^\mu \theta) \\
& - \frac{1}{2} (i \bar{\psi}_\mu \gamma_5 \gamma_\nu \nabla_\rho \psi_\sigma \epsilon^{\mu\nu\rho\sigma} + e \bar{\chi} \not{\nabla} \chi) \\
& + \frac{1}{2\sqrt{2}M_P} e \bar{\chi} \gamma^\mu \gamma^\nu \nabla_\nu (f e^{-i\gamma_5 \theta}) \psi_\mu - \frac{1}{16M_P^2} f^2 \nabla_\mu \theta (\bar{\psi}_\nu \gamma_\rho \psi_\sigma \epsilon^{\mu\nu\rho\sigma} + i e \bar{\chi} \gamma_5 \gamma^\mu \chi) \\
& + \frac{1}{128M_P^2} \bar{\chi} \gamma_5 \gamma_\sigma \chi (4i \bar{\psi}_\mu \gamma_\nu \psi_\rho \epsilon^{\mu\nu\rho\sigma} - 4e \bar{\psi}_\mu \gamma_5 \gamma^\sigma \psi^\mu - e \bar{\chi} \gamma_5 \gamma^\sigma \chi) .
\end{aligned} \tag{lag0}$$

The matter fields are: f , a real scalar field; θ , a real periodic pseudo-scalar; and χ , a Majorana spinor. In the gravity sector, one has the gravitino, ψ_μ , which is a Majorana

spinor-vector; and the vierbein, e^a_μ .[‡] The spin connections in all the covariant derivatives are the usual connections compatible with the vierbein, plus torsion terms involving the gravitino[West]. Using these spin connections, the Ricci scalar is defined from the Riemann tensor: $R \equiv e^\mu_a e^\nu_b R_{\mu\nu}{}^{ba}$. Finally, $e \equiv |\det e^a_\mu|$, and $\epsilon^{\mu\nu\rho\sigma}$ is the antisymmetric tensor *density*, defined so that $\epsilon^{0123} = 1$.

One may choose a real representation for γ^μ , in which the Majorana spinor fields are real, and γ_5 is imaginary. This convention will be useful below in making clear our method of Wick rotating (lag0).

This Lagrangian is invariant (up to a total derivative) under the following local supersymmetry transformations[bagger, cremmer]:

$$\begin{aligned}
\delta f &= \bar{\epsilon} e^{-i\gamma_5 \theta} \chi; & \delta \theta &= -\frac{i}{f} \bar{\epsilon} \gamma_5 e^{-i\gamma_5 \theta} \chi; \\
\delta \chi &= e^{-i\gamma_5 \theta} (\nabla_\mu f + i f \gamma_5 \nabla_\mu \theta) \gamma^\mu \epsilon + \frac{f}{8M_P^2} (\bar{\chi} e^{-i\gamma_5 \theta} \gamma_5 \epsilon) \gamma_5 \chi \\
&\quad - \frac{1}{2\sqrt{2}M_P} ((\bar{\psi}^\mu \chi) + \gamma_5 (\bar{\psi}^\mu \gamma_5 \chi)) \gamma_\mu \epsilon; \\
\delta e^a_\mu &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}M_P} \bar{\epsilon} \gamma^a \psi_\mu; \\
\delta \psi_\mu &= 2\sqrt{2}M_P \nabla_\mu \epsilon - \frac{f}{8M_P^2} (\bar{\chi} e^{-i\gamma_5 \theta} \gamma_5 \epsilon) \gamma_5 \psi_\mu \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{4\sqrt{2}M_P} (\sigma_{\mu\nu} (\bar{\chi} \gamma_5 \gamma^\nu \chi) + 2i f^2 \nabla_\mu \theta) \gamma_5 \epsilon;
\end{aligned} \tag{lsusy0}$$

to first order in the Grassman Majorana spinor field ϵ . As usual, $\sigma_{\mu\nu} \equiv \frac{1}{2}[\gamma_\mu, \gamma_\nu]$.

In order to find a wormhole, we must first Wick rotate to Euclidean four-space. This poses an apparent problem, because there are no Majorana spinor representations of $SO(4)$. However, while we cannot find spinor representations of $SO(4)$ such that $\chi^\dagger \gamma_4 = \chi^T C$, they are not needed — actually we only need

$$\bar{\chi} = \chi^T C. \tag{conj}$$

[‡] Greek and Roman letters indicate tensor and Lorentz indices, respectively. The latter are raised and lowered with the trace +2 Minkowski metric.

Therefore we *define* our adjoint spinors with Majorana conjugation (conj)[majic]. In the Lorentzian theory where the fermions are Majorana spinors, the use of this convention instead of the usual Dirac conjugation does not affect the theory. In the Euclidean version of the theory, the action will only contain χ and ψ_μ , making no reference to $\chi^\dagger$ or $\psi_\mu^\dagger$. Hence the fermion path integral can be regarded as an analytic contour integral in the spinor field space, and still contains precisely the correct number of degrees of freedom for a supersymmetric theory.

Wick rotation therefore yields

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{L}_E = & -M_P^2 e R + \frac{1}{2} e (\nabla_\mu f \nabla^\mu f + f^2 \nabla_\mu \theta \nabla^\mu \theta) \\
& - \frac{1}{2} (\bar{\psi}_\mu \gamma_5 \gamma_\nu \nabla_\rho \psi_\sigma \epsilon^{\mu\nu\rho\sigma} - e \bar{\chi} \not{\nabla} \chi) \\
& - \frac{1}{2\sqrt{2}M_P} e \bar{\chi} \gamma^\mu \gamma^\nu \nabla_\nu (f e^{-i\gamma_5 \theta}) \psi_\mu + \frac{i}{16M_P^2} f^2 \nabla_\mu \theta (\bar{\psi}_\nu \gamma_\rho \psi_\sigma \epsilon^{\mu\nu\rho\sigma} + e \bar{\chi} \gamma_5 \gamma^\mu \chi) \\
& + \frac{1}{128M_P^2} \bar{\chi} \gamma_5 \gamma_\sigma \chi (4 \bar{\psi}_\mu \gamma_\nu \psi_\rho \epsilon^{\mu\nu\rho\sigma} + 4 e \bar{\psi}_\mu \gamma_5 \gamma^\sigma \psi^\mu + e \bar{\chi} \gamma_5 \gamma^\sigma \chi) .
\end{aligned} \tag{lag1}$$

Our conventions are: $\epsilon^{\mu\nu\sigma\rho}$ is ± 1 or 0 in both Euclidean and Lorentzian space. Euclidean indices range from 1 to 4 instead of 0 to 3. $v^4 \equiv -iv^0$, $v_4 \equiv iv_0$ where the vector v has either tensor or $\text{SO}(4)/\text{Lorentz}$ indices. Note that $\mathcal{L}_E$ is not real, but this is not a problem — we only require a Hermitian Lagrangian when we analytically continue back to real time. Note that (lsusy0) is indeed a symmetry of $\mathcal{L}_E$ using Majorana conjugation to define the adjoint spinors. However if the phase of ϵ is arbitrary, then these transformations may not preserve the reality of all the bosonic fields in the Euclidean theory. If we choose the phase to always preserve the reality of the vierbein, one must regard the matter fields $\phi = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} f e^{i\theta}$ and $\phi^\dagger = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} f e^{-i\theta}$ as independent fields rather than complex conjugates.

It is immediately clear that setting χ and ψ_μ equal to zero in (lag1) produces the bosonic Lagrangian (1). This establishes property 1 of section 3, which showed that the bosonic wormhole solution is also a saddlepoint of the supergravity theory. Also, since (lsusy0) is still a symmetry of the Euclidean Lagrangian, property 3 is valid ($N = 1$

supersymmetry).

We can now proceed with a supersymmetric version of the Routhian formalism. Our system is invariant under the global U(1) transformation

$$\begin{aligned}\theta &\rightarrow \theta + \delta \\ \chi &\rightarrow e^{i\gamma_5\delta}\chi.\end{aligned}\tag{28}$$

This symmetry provides the generalization of the charge that was important in section 2. We can simplify many of our subsequent expressions by re-defining the fermion field so that it is invariant under (28). Henceforth, we use

$$\chi = e^{i\gamma_5\theta}\xi.\tag{xi}$$

The Lagrangian may be re-written as

$$\mathcal{L}_E \equiv \bar{\mathcal{L}} + e\beta^\mu \nabla_\mu \theta + \frac{1}{2}ef^2 \nabla_\mu \theta \nabla^\mu \theta,\tag{30}$$

where $\bar{\mathcal{L}}$ is independent of θ :

$$\begin{aligned}\bar{\mathcal{L}} = & -M_P^2 e R + \frac{1}{2}e \nabla_\mu f \nabla^\mu f + \frac{1}{2}e \bar{\xi} \not{\nabla} \xi - \frac{1}{2} \bar{\psi}_\mu \gamma_5 \gamma_\nu \nabla_\rho \psi_\sigma \epsilon^{\mu\nu\rho\sigma} \\ & - \frac{\nabla_\nu f}{2\sqrt{2}M_P} e \bar{\xi} \gamma^\mu \gamma^\nu \psi_\mu + \frac{e}{32M_P^2} (\bar{\xi} \xi)^2 \\ & + \frac{1}{32M_P^2} \bar{\xi} \gamma_5 \gamma_\sigma \xi (\bar{\psi}_\mu \gamma_\nu \psi_\rho \epsilon^{\mu\nu\rho\sigma} + e \bar{\psi}_\mu \gamma_5 \gamma^\sigma \psi^\mu),\end{aligned}\tag{30}$$

and

$$\beta^\mu \equiv \frac{if^2}{16M_P^2} \left(\frac{1}{e} \bar{\psi}_\nu \gamma_\rho \psi_\sigma \epsilon^{\mu\nu\rho\sigma} + e \bar{\xi} \gamma_5 \gamma^\mu \xi \right) - \frac{i}{2} \bar{\xi} \gamma_5 \gamma^\mu \xi + \frac{i}{2\sqrt{2}M_P} \bar{\xi} \gamma^\nu \gamma^\mu \gamma_5 \psi_\nu.\tag{beta}$$

We can now construct a Routhian form of the path integral following Reference [cole]. The supergravity Routhian is obtained by introducing the four-vector density j^μ conjugate to θ , which allows us to exchange the path integral over $(e_\mu^a, \psi_\mu, \xi, f, \theta)$ for one over $(e_\mu^a, \psi_\mu, \xi, f, j^\mu)$,

$$\begin{aligned}\langle F | e^{-\int d^4x \mathcal{H}} | I \rangle &= \int \mathcal{D}e_\mu^a \mathcal{D}\psi_\mu \mathcal{D}\xi \mathcal{D}f \mathcal{D}\theta e^{-S} \\ &= \int \mathcal{D}e_\mu^a \mathcal{D}\psi_\mu \mathcal{D}\xi \mathcal{D}f \mathcal{D}j^\mu e^{-S'}.\end{aligned}$$

We multiply the path integral by a normalized Gaussian integral over j^μ .

$$\begin{aligned} e^{-S} &= \int \mathcal{D}j^\mu e^{-\int d^4x \mathcal{L}} e^{-\int d^4x \frac{1}{2f^2} [j^\mu - ie(f^2 \nabla^\mu \theta + \beta^\mu)]^2} \\ &= \int \mathcal{D}j^\mu e^{-\int d^4x [\bar{\mathcal{L}} + \frac{1}{2ef^2} (j^\mu - ie\beta^\mu)^2 - ij^\mu \nabla_\mu \theta]} \end{aligned} \quad (ro0)$$

As in section 2, the term $j^\mu \nabla_\mu \theta$ is integrated by parts, and then the path integral over θ produces a delta function and surface terms.

$$e^{-S'} = \exp \left[-i \oint d^3\Omega_3 Q(\theta_+ - \theta_-) - \int d^4x \mathcal{R} \right] \times \delta(\partial_\mu j^\mu) \quad (32)$$

where the Routhian $\mathcal{R}$ is

$$\mathcal{R} = \bar{\mathcal{L}} + \frac{1}{2f^2} (j_\mu - ie\beta_\mu)^2. \quad (blap)$$

Also θ_+ and θ_- are values of θ on boundary surfaces, and Q is the U(1) charge passing through these surfaces. As in section 2, the initial and final slices are the cut-off surfaces on either side of the superwormhole, at $r_\pm = r_0$. Also, we will employ $e^{-S'}$ inside the wormhole region, and e^{-S} in the background outside. Summing over all values of the charge Q makes the surface terms in (32) serve as projection operators from the θ basis to the basis of charge eigenstates[cole].

We must now consider the supersymmetry properties of our Routhian. These are most easily determined by considering the equations of motion. The saddle-point of the Gaussian in (ro0) is given by

$$j_\mu = ie(f^2 \nabla_\mu \theta + \beta_\mu). \quad (zm0)$$

Up to the substitution (zm0), the equations of motion (and hence the saddle-points) of $\mathcal{R}$ and $\mathcal{L}$ coincide. Having made the substitution (xi), the only appearance that θ makes in the supersymmetry transformations (lsusy0) is as $\nabla_\mu \theta$. These terms can be replaced using (zm0), and the supersymmetry transformation of j_μ is easily derived as the variation of the right-hand-side of (zm0) under (lsusy0).

The local supersymmetry transformations describe the fermionic gauge degrees of freedom of the supergravity theory. To discuss the physical degrees of freedom, one must prescribe a particular choice of gauge-fixing. We will impose $\gamma^\mu \psi_\mu = 0$. Given the wormhole solution, certain transformations will still leave the gauge constraint invariant. These field variations are the physical (fermionic) zero modes. The zero mode equation, $\gamma^\mu \delta \psi_\mu = 0$, yields in the bosonic wormhole background,

$$\not{V} \epsilon = -\frac{Q}{4M_P^2 r^3} \gamma^4 \gamma_5 \epsilon. \quad (zma)$$

More convenient co-ordinates are those that map both sides of the wormhole. Let $x^4 = x \equiv \arccos \frac{L^2}{r^2}$, and take Euler angles on the three-sphere as x^i for $i \in \{1, 2, 3\}$. Using the vierbien and spin connection for the metric (ans) transformed into these co-ordinates, (zma) becomes

$$\gamma^4 \left(2(\cos x)^{\frac{3}{2}} \partial_x + \frac{3}{2}(\cos x)^{\frac{1}{2}} \sin x \right) \epsilon - (\cos x)^{\frac{1}{2}} \gamma^i \nabla_i^{(3)} \epsilon - \frac{Q(\cos x)^{\frac{3}{2}}}{8M_P^2 L^2} \gamma^4 \gamma_5 \epsilon = 0, \quad (zm1)$$

where $\nabla_i^{(3)}$ is the spinor covariant derivative on the round unit three-sphere, and γ^i are Dirac matrices projected onto the unit three-sphere dreibein. We can separate variables by choosing the *ansatz*

$$\epsilon = k(x) \eta(\Omega)$$

with η , a spinor that depends only on the angular variables, and the matrix $k(x)$ takes the form, $k = k_1 + k_5 \gamma_5$.

Asymptotically we are looking for a spinor which becomes covariantly constant, so that the variation of the fields vanishes there.

$$\lim_{x \rightarrow \pm \frac{\pi}{2}} \nabla_i \epsilon = \lim_{x \rightarrow \pm \frac{\pi}{2}} (\nabla_i^{(3)} \epsilon + \frac{1}{2} \sin x \gamma^4 \gamma_i \epsilon) = 0 \quad (zm2)$$

This implies that

$$\gamma^i \nabla_i^{(3)} \eta = \pm \frac{3}{2} \gamma^4 \eta. \quad (zm3)$$

Notice that the only way both limits in (zm2) can hold true is if ϵ vanishes at one end of the wormhole, and approaches a constant η at the other. The equation for k is

$$\partial_x \ln k = \frac{Q}{16M_P^2 L^2} \gamma_5 - \frac{3}{4} \tan\left(\frac{x}{2} \pm \frac{\pi}{4}\right),$$

which is easily solved to yield

$$\epsilon_{\pm} = \left[\cos\left(\frac{x}{2} \pm \frac{\pi}{4}\right) \right]^{\frac{3}{2}} \exp\left[\frac{Q\gamma_5(x \pm \frac{\pi}{2})}{12M_P^2 L^2} \right] \eta. \quad (zm4)$$

As in section 2, there are distinct zero modes for each end of the wormhole. $\epsilon_{\pm}$ vanish for $x \rightarrow \pm\frac{\pi}{2}$ and become covariantly constant spinors η as $x \rightarrow \mp\frac{\pi}{2}$. Being covariantly constant according to the flat space connection which prevails asymptotically far from the wormhole, it is η which is analogous to the constant parameter of rigid supersymmetry, and which parametrizes the supersymmetric zero mode of the wormhole.

Now finally we return to property 2 of section 3. Letting $M_P \rightarrow \infty$ in (lag1) (and neglecting free gravitons and gravitinos) produces the Euclidean Lagrangian of the free Wess-Zumino model. Furthermore in this limit with a covariantly constant supersymmetry parameter, (lsusy0) reduces to the standard supersymmetry transformations of the free Wess-Zumino model. Since our zero modes are indeed covariantly constant asymptotically, they correspond precisely to a global Wess-Zumino supersymmetry transformation, and property 2 is also valid. Since the vierbein and gravitino are invariant under these transformations, we are justified in disregarding the supergravity sector in the background region, and representing the effects of wormholes as extra vertices in an effective *flat* superspace action. Above we have only considered the first order supersymmetry transformations. The finite transformations may be obtained by iterating our first order calculation up to fourth order. It is straightforward to show that, through all iterations, the fermionic zero mode still corresponds to the Wess-Zumino supersymmetry to leading order in L/r_0 .

REFERENCES

1. S. Coleman, *Aspects of Symmetry: Selected Erice Lectures* (Cambridge University Press; New York, 1985), Chapter 7, “The Uses of Instantons.”

- cole. S. Coleman and K. Lee, *Phys. Lett.* **221B**, 242 (1989).

- cliff. C.P. Burgess and A. Kshirsagar, *Nucl. Phys.* **B324**, 157 (1989).

- gold. H. Goldstein, *Classical Mechanics*, 2nd ed. (Addison-Wesley; Reading, Mass., 1980), p. 351.

- surf. J.W. York, Jr., *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **28**, 1082 (1972) ; S.W. Hawking, *Phys. Rev.* **D18**, 1747 (1978).

5. S.B. Giddings and A. Strominger, *Nucl. Phys.* **B306**, 890 (1988).

6. J. Wess and J. Bagger, *Supersymmetry and Supergravity* (Princeton University Press; Princeton NJ, 1983).

- West. P. West, *Introduction to Supersymmetry and Supergravity* (World Scientific; Singapore, 1986).

- cremmer. E. Cremmer *et al.*, *Nucl. Phys.* **B147**, 105 (1979).

10. Y. Park, M. Srednicki, A. Strominger, *Phys. Lett.* **244B**, 393 (1990).

- k. S.W. Hawking, *Phys. Rev.* **D37**, 904 (1988).

- alpha. S. Coleman, *Nucl. Phys.* **B307**, 864 (1988) ; T. Banks, I. Klebanov, and L. Susskind, *Nucl. Phys.* **B317**, 665 (1989) ; R.C. Myers, *Nucl. Phys.* **B323**, 225 (1989).

- bagger. J. Bagger, *Nucl. Phys.* **B211**, 303 (1983).

- feyn. R.P. Feynman and A.R. Hibbs, *Quantum Mechanics and Path Integrals* (McGraw-Hill Inc.; New York, 1965).
- andy. S.B. Giddings and A. Strominger, *Nucl. Phys.* **B321**, 481 (1989).
- sttev. S.B. Giddings and A. Strominger, *Phys. Lett.* **230B**, 46 (1989).
- big. W. Fischler and L. Susskind, *Phys. Lett.* **217B**, 48 (1989); S. Coleman and K. Lee, *Phys. Lett.* **221B**, 242 (1989).
- myers. R.C. Myers, *Phys. Rev.* **D38**, 1327 (1988).
- grin. B. Grinstein and J. Maharana, *Nucl. Phys.* **B333**, 160 (1990).
- ab. L.F. Abbott and M.B. Wise, *Nucl. Phys.* **B325**, 687 (1989).
- raja. see for example: R. Rajaraman, *Solitons and Instantons: An Introduction to Solitons and Instantons in Quantum Field Theory* (North-Holland Publishing Co.; New York, 1982).
- majic. see for example: P. van Nieuwenhuizen in: B.S. DeWitt and R. Stora, eds., *Relativity, groups and topology II* (Elsevier Science Publishers; 1984)
- fay. P.D. D'Eath, H.F. Dowker, and D.I. Hughes, "Supersymmetric Quantum Wormhole States," DAMTP preprint R90-23, presented at 5th Seminar on Quantum Gravity, Moscow, U.S.S.R., May 28 - Jun 1, 1990.
- andyrev. A. Strominger, "Baby Universes," in the proceedings of the 1988 TASI summer school.
- twilight. see for example: S.J. Gates, M.T. Grisaru, M. Roček and W. Siegel, *Superspace* (Benjamin/Cummings Publishing Co., Reading, Massachusetts, 1983).
- ian. I. Affleck, J. Harvey and E. Witten, *Nucl.Phys.* **B206**, 413 (1982).
- gerry. G. Gilbert, *Nucl.Phys.* **B328**, 159 (1989).

kim. K. Lee and S.M. Smirnakis, “Wormholes Made of Fermions,” Harvard preprint HUTP-89-A024, May 1989.

FIGURE CAPTIONS

Figure 1: Surfaces of constant Euclidean time in the wormhole geometry, using radial $(r_{\pm}, I, F)$ or rectangular $(t_{\pm}, i_{\pm}, f_{\pm})$ time slices.